

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE-United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/444,173	11/19/1999	FONG PONG	HP10981470-1	8306
75	11/04/2003		EXAMINER	
IP ADMINISTRATION			SONG, JASMINE	
LEGAL DEPA	RTMENT 20BN			D. DCD 1//0 (DCD
HEWLETT PA	CKARD COMPANY		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P O BOX 1030		·	2188	21
PALO ALTO,	CA 943030890		DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
Advisory Action	09/444,173	PONG, FONG	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
*	Jasmine Song	2188	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 14 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applicate a timely filed amendment which (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a ition in
	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	f extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	ount of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
10. Other:			· V.
			\
			`

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

the Examiner considered the applicant's arguments filed on 10/14/2003, however, the arguments regarding independent claims 1,9,19 are not persuasive because the arguments are addressed in the previous final rejection, therefore, the Examiner maintains the previous ground final office action filed on 08/14/2003.

10/30/02

Mano PADMANARMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT ELAMINER
TC 2100